

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet, which includes Fig. 3, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3. In Figure 3, previously wrongly labeled element keyword list 347 has been corrected.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed March 1, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application. Claims 57-84 are presented for examination. Claim 76 has been cancelled.

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicants have enclosed a corrected Figure 3, which indicates that the number for the keyword list is 347. This change is supported in the Specification, and adds no new matter.

INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, as originally filed, did incorporate by reference the parent application, now U.S. Patent 6,026,410. The correction in the previous response was simply to add this reference to the Specification. Therefore, Applicants are unclear on which omission should be declared inadvertent. However, to be clear, the omission of this reference from the Specification of the present application was inadvertent.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The Examiner rejected claims 60-62, 66, 76-77 under 35 USC 112, First Paragraph. In particular, the Examiner objected to certain claim language. Applicants are herewith including references in the application which provide support for the objected-to claim language.

Support for the limitation "the feedback is provided immediately when a character is entered that completes a keyword" is shown in parent patent 6,026,410 at column 7, lines 1-31; column 9, lines 51-54; and column 14. The feedback is provided by highlighting the parsed keywords, or outputting them in the shadow region.

Support for the limitation "the feedback is provided upon entry of a delimiter character indicating the completion of the entry of a word" is shown in parent patent 6,026,410 9, lines 51-54; and column 14. The parsing continues until a delimiter character is reached which enables recognition of the completed keyword.

Support for the limitation "the feedback is provided after the message request is dispatched" is page 10, lines 6-13 of the present application.

Support for the limitation "provides guidance to the user to enter the fields appropriate to be included in the request" is shown in parent patent 6,026,410 at column 7, lines 1-31.

Support for the limitation "the individual user may add aliases for keywords which aliases are subsequently operative as keywords for that user" is shown in parent patent 6,026,410 at column 12, lines 5-24.

Claim 76 has been cancelled.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Examiner rejected claims 60-62, 66, and 77 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Explanation for the limitation "the feedback is provided immediately when a character is entered that completes a keyword" is, as noted above, the highlighting of the keyword or otherwise indicating that a keyword has been detected.

Explanation for the limitation "the feedback is provided upon entry of a delimiter character indicating the completion of the entry of a word" uses the buffering-parser description provided in the application which only parses once a delimiter character has been received, and then provides the visual feedback to the user.

Explanation for the limitation "the feedback is provided after the message request is dispatched" is discussed in the present application, for example at page 10, lines 6-13, which indicates that the message request is reviewed and if there are problems feedback is provided prompting the user to make corrections.

Explanation for the limitation "provides guidance to the user to enter the fields appropriate to be included in the request" discusses the linking which indicates which terms have been detected and filled in. For example, if a destination is lacking in the request, the appropriate icon would not be populated. This would provide feedback that this field is still required.

Explanation for the limitation "the individual user may add aliases for keywords which aliases are subsequently operative as keywords for that user" is provided in the parent application, which discusses customizable keywords which enable the user of aliases.

In particular, with respect to claim 47-48, the Examiner objected to the terminology that the keyword is user customizable. Support for this limitation may be found, for example, in the parent patent of the present application, incorporated therein by reference, for example in published patent 6,026,410, column 12, lines 5-24.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 57-59, 63-65, 67-69, 71-76 and 78-79 under Tso.

Tso discloses a communications system and a method for distributing information involving a server and a client connected to a network where the server selectively sends information to the client based on a filter (Abstract). The system automatically distributes electronic information to a targeted group of users (Column 2, lines 40-42). Instead of relying on the efforts of a user to find and retrieve information, Tso allows an InfoCast server to send information or a pointer to the information such as a uniform resource locator (URL) directly to the user (Column 1, lines 44-48). What information is sent to the user is dependent on various factors, including: the location of the user; the time of day; and the information contained in a user profile (Column 1, lines 48-50). Tso thus discloses a communication system which automatically sends certain types of information to particular users, without the user explicitly requesting it. Tso does not teach or suggest a system where a user specifically requests certain information, which is sent back to him or her. Rather, Tso teaches away from sending requested data, by focusing in automatically broadcast data, without requiring a user request.

The Examiner points to various places in Tso for the limitation of receiving a request message from the user. However, the referenced sections of Tso simply discuss that "InfoBites" are created and the user may request additional information based on the InfoBite received. Nowhere does Tso teach or suggest the user's message to request one or more actions to be taken by a server, based on analyzed keywords. The only action that the user of Tso can request is the full information based on the InfoBite.

The claims of the present invention focus on receiving a request from a user and identifying keywords in that request. As Tso does not receive user requests, Tso does

not anticipate the presently pending claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 70 and 80-84 under 35 USC 103(a) over Tso in view of U.S. Patent 6,151,610 to Senn.

Senn discusses a document management apparatus that includes a scripting language and controls documents based on setting attributes.


The Examiner continues to rely on Tso for receiving a request message which is parsed. As noted above, Tso does not teach or suggest this limitation. Senn does not remedy this shortcoming of Tso. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not obvious over Tso in view of Senn.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Judith A. Szepesi at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/10, 2006



Judith A. Szepesi
Reg. No, 39,393

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300




Fig. 3